

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Application Serial No. 10/728,273
Filing Date 12/04/2003
Confirmation No. 7122
Inventorship Kulkarni, Harish
Applicant..... Microsoft Corporation
Group Art Unit..... 2629
Examiner Abdin, Shaheda
Attorney Docket No. MS1-1706US
Title: SCALABLE DISPLAY

PRE-APPEAL CONFERENCE REQUEST

To: Commissioner of Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

From: David S. Lee (Tel. 206-315-7912)
Customer No. 22801
Lee & Hayes PLLC
601 W. Riverside Ave, Suite 1400
Spokane, WA 99201

Sir:

The Pre-Appeal Panel (hereinafter "Panel") is respectfully requested to consider this Request, which is submitted in accordance with the Pre-Appeal Brief Conference Program rules. A summary of the claim rejections is found in the Final Office Action, dated September 16, 2008 (hereinafter "Final Office Action"). The Applicant herein discusses salient parts of the Final Office Action. The Applicant also references the Advisory Action dated December 12, 2008. Claims 1-10, 12-13, 15-16 and 18-20, as currently pending, are listed in the Applicant's Response dated November 17, 2008.

Independent claims 1 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Firester et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,622,241 B1 (hereinafter "Firester") in view of Li et al. "Building and Using A Scalable Display Wall System", 2000 IEEE (hereinafter "Li"). Independent claim 18 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Firester, Li and Ellis et al., U.S. Patent No. 4,562,450 (hereinafter Ellis). Independent claim 12 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Firester, Ellis, Cok et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,999,045 B2 (hereinafter "Cok") and Sakai et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,680,525 (hereinafter "Sakai").

Applicant carefully considered the texts of Firester and Li and was unable to find any disclosure that suggests at least "receiving configuration information respectively from a plurality of clients, each of the received configuration information including attribute information associated with a small display that is part of the large display" and "reformatting the video data on an intermediate computer for display on a number of the small displays that are part of the large display," as recited in claim 1.

Each of the other independent claims 6, 12 and 18 recite subject matter that is similar to that discussed hereinbelow in connection with claim 1, and the additional documents relied upon by the Office to reject claims 6, 12 and 18 do not remedy the deficiencies of the Firester and Li combination. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of claims 6, 12 and 18 should be reversed for at least the same reasons discussed hereinbelow in connection with claim 1.

Firester discloses a display system 100 that includes a display screen 102 that displays an image by way of a plurality of image generating devices 110, 120, 130 and 140. (*See Fig. 2; column 3, lines 19-21 of Firester.*) The image generating devices 110, 120, 130 and 140 are interfaced with image processors IP1, IP2, IP3, and IP4,

respectively. And the image processors IP1, IP2, IP3, and IP4 are each connected to a single image server 106. (*Column 4, lines 14-30.*)

Li discloses a system that provides a large-display using several conventional components. The system includes a display cluster that includes multiple computers that each drive a projection device. (*See Figure 1 of Li.*)

However, the Firester and Li combination does not suggest a computer to receive "configuration information individually from a plurality of clients," as is recited in claim 1. Rather, each image processor IP1, IP2, IP3, and IP4 does its own reformatting of the video data for display on the display screen 102. Firester explicitly discloses this fact. That is, Firester states that

"[i]mage processor IP1 processes the image data [from image server 106] for the portion of the image produced by image generator 110, such as by *reformatting, decompressing, rendering, decoding, and predistorting*, and sends that modified image data to image generator 110 on a pixel-by-pixel basis." (*See column 4, lines 23-28.*) The other image processors IP2, IP3 and IP4 behave in the same manner as the image processor IP1.

Thus, because the Firester and Li combination suggests that each of the image processor IP1, IP2, IP3, and IP4 is responsible for its own rendering and display, it follows that those image processors IP1, IP2, IP3, and IP4 would not distribute "configuration information" that enables "an intermediate computer" to reformat video data, as is claimed in claim 1.

The Office maintains that the image server 106 reformats image data received from an image source. But in fact, the image server 106 merely "provides image data received from an image source... to each of the image processors IP1, IP2, IP3 and IP4." (*See column 4, line 14 and line 23; Firester.*) Therefore, the Firester and Li combination does not suggest "reformatting the video data on *an intermediate computer* for display

on a number of the small displays that are part of the large display," as recited in claim 1. Instead, as is discussed above, reformatting is performed by the individual image processors IP1, IP2, IP3, and IP4.

The foregoing shows that at least the "receiving" and "reformatting" acts of claim 1 are not suggested by the Firester and Li combination. Although the following arguments reference claim 1 directly, the arguments are also relevant to claims 6, 12 and 18. Specifically, the Firester and Li combination at least does not suggest the "receiving, at an intermediate computer..." and "sending" acts of claim 6; the Firester, Li and Ellis combination does not suggest at least the "receive" and "reformat" functionality associated with the claimed "configuration module" of claim 18; and the Firester, Ellis, Cok and Sakai combination does not suggest at least the details of the "gateway computer" recited in claim 12.

In the Advisory Action, the Examiner asserts Firester discloses that the image server 106 reformats video data in the same manner as claimed. The Office points to *column 5, lines 1-25* of Firester, as the location that discloses the details of the image server 106. The indicated portion of Firester states that the image server 106 is responsible for generating a test image on a screen 102. Then, the image server 106 and/or the image processors IP1-IP4 "adjust the relative brightness" of sub-image generators 110, 120..., which are part of the screen 102. However, adjusting the relative brightness of image generators (e.g., display devices) by way of the image server 106 is not the same as the claimed reformatting of video data by way of a single intermediate computer.

In accordance with the foregoing remarks, the Panel is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the claim rejections. Applicant believes that the pending claims are allowable and the application is in condition for allowance. Therefore, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: February 17, 2009

By: Tim R. Wyckoff/
David S. Lee
Reg. No. 38,222

Tim R. Wyckoff
Reg. No. 46,175
Email: timw@sprip.com

PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW		Docket Number (Optional) MS1-1706US	
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to "Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450" [37 CFR 1.8(a)] on _____ Signature _____ Typed or printed name _____ n/a Filed via EFS Web.		Application Number 10/728,273	Filed 12/4/2003
First Named Inventor Harish Sripad Kulkarni		Examiner Shaheda Abdin	
Art Unit 2629		Examiner Shaheda Abdin	
<p>Applicant requests review of the final rejection in the above-identified application. No amendments are being filed with this request.</p> <p>This request is being filed with a notice of appeal.</p> <p>The review is requested for the reason(s) stated on the attached sheet(s). Note: No more than five (5) pages may be provided.</p> <p>I am the</p> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> <div style="width: 45%;"> <p><input type="checkbox"/> applicant/inventor.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> assignee of record of the entire interest. See 37 CFR 3.71. Statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) is enclosed. (Form PTO/SB/96)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> attorney or agent of record. Registration number 46175</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> attorney or agent acting under 37 CFR 1.34. Registration number if acting under 37 CFR 1.34 _____</p> </div> <div style="width: 45%; text-align: right;"> <p>_____ /Tim R. Wyckoff/ Signature</p> <p>Tim R. Wyckoff Typed or printed name</p> <p>206-315-4001 Telephone number</p> <p>February 17, 2009 Date</p> </div> </div> <p>NOTE: Signatures of all the inventors or assignees of record of the entire interest or their representative(s) are required. Submit multiple forms if more than one signature is required, see below*.</p>			
<p><input type="checkbox"/> *Total of _____ forms are submitted.</p>			

This collection of information is required by 35 U.S.C. 132. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11, 1.14 and 41.6. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.